

present avenues through which the coal now passes to market from the mines will be insufficient to supply the wants of the country east of the Alleghany mountain.

Already while in its infancy has the Schuylkill Company, hitherto almost solely dependent upon its coal trade, found it necessary to double their locks.

Are the Undersigned then, in view of what has occurred and that which, in all probability, must occur, visionary when they say, that in comparatively a few years the trade upon the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, will demand a double set of locks—shall its extension to Baltimore be a work inferior in capacity to the main canal?

The time was, when small canals in this country were in *fashion*. In 18— the James river canal was commenced by the State of Virginia—after an expenditure of about two millions and with but a small part of it accomplished the work was suspended; its dimensions were those of a small canal.

Recently the work has been revived under the direction of a joint stock company. The dimensions of the new work are those of a *large canal*, and all that was formally done is to be altered to conform to the present plan. In 1822 Briggs made a survey and estimate for a canal up the Potomac on the ground now occupied by the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal—he advised a *small canal*. The year afterwards, he made his survey of the cross cut from Monocacy to Baltimore, and of course, he advised the same size of canal that he had just previously recommended for the Potomac canal. Fortunately however, when that work was commenced in 1828, under the name of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, more enlarged and correct views were abroad, and the work was commenced and has since been carried on upon the plan of a canal of the largest class. The same views that governed Briggs in 1823, in proposing a small canal across Parr's ridge, would cause him at this day to advocate the same dimensions as those adopted on the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. He was aware that they must conform to each other.

Again—The question was discussed in a report by the Union Canal Company of Pennsylvania soon after the surveys on the Potomac by Briggs—in regard to the propriety of the small dimensions they had adopted for their work. They refer to the size proposed for the Potomac.